



# AN INTERVIEW WITH FATHER JOHN BERG, FSSP

*interviewed by The Latin Mass*

**I**n anticipation of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Priestly Fraternity of Saint Peter on July 18, 2013, *The Latin Mass* requested and was granted an interview with Father John Berg, FSSP, Superior General. Please note that this interview with Father Berg took place *before the election of Pope Francis*.

**TLM:** *Thank you, Father Berg, for granting this interview on the present and future of the Priestly Fraternity of Saint Peter (FSSP) and the Latin Mass movement in general.*

## **The Progress of the Priestly Fraternity's Mission**

**TLM:** *Regarding the present, where does FSSP stand today in terms of the number of priests, seminarians, and approved Latin Mass centers as compared with ten years ago? Has the pontificate of Benedict XVI produced marked growth in these areas or has it remained a slow and steady process of growth and expansion?*

**Father Berg:** There has been great growth in all of these areas for the Priestly Fraternity of Saint Peter during these last ten years, and the pontificate of Benedict XVI was certainly a large help to opening doors and giving legitimacy

to requests that had been made for years in some places. Still it is God Himself who sends the vocations, and the constant stream over these last twenty-five years is a sign; and I hope that I may say this, that God is pleased with the character of service which we in the FSSP strive to offer Him through our fidelity to the traditional Mass as well as through our fidelity to the Sovereign Pontiff. More and more vocations come to us through our own apostolates

---

**The pontificate of Benedict XVI was certainly a large help to opening doors and giving legitimacy to requests that had been made for years in some places.**

---

and – and this I believe to be most significant – through the priests who now, in the era of *Summorum Pontificum*, celebrate the traditional Mass regularly in their parish churches. At the same time, I believe the growth would still best be described as being slow and steady due to our own limitations as a Society of Apostolic Life. The pontificate allowed us in a certain

way to be more selective and to discern where our efforts would be most fruitful and which situations would be best for the life of our priests and their sanctification. This is a frustration to the faithful at times who would like us to begin more apostolates, but our first concern is to make sure that our foundation is solid, especially where the life of our priests is concerned. The urgency for expansion I would say in one sense was actually reduced by the acts of Benedict XVI as he opened up a greater number of avenues for the rightful desires of the faithful to be fulfilled,

for example, by local priests. We have participated in the training of several hundred religious and diocesan priests for the traditional Mass both at our own houses and ‘on-site.’ And, as I say, we already benefit from the fruits of these labors.

**TLM:** *How would you describe the impact of Summorum Pontificum on FSSP’s mission? Have the bishops been more receptive to your presence in dioceses since its promulgation, and, if so, are we talking about a major thaw on account of Summorum or merely a slight softening of resistance to the return of the Latin Mass?*

**Father Berg:** The invitations extended to our Fraternity have increased to the point where we simply do not have the priests or resources to respond to all of them. But to measure the true impact of *Summorum Pontificum* by the invitations extended to our Fraternity into dioceses would be to sell it far short. Many saw the primary purpose of the document as providing the means to increase the positive response to the requests of the faithful for what is now called the extraordinary form. This was certainly part of the goal, but the program of Benedict XVI was much wiser and more profound than simply this. I believe that the document was written primarily for priests. How else can one explain certain points of the document such as the permission for all priests to also pray the Roman Breviary according to the books of 1962 or supplement in their parishes the new Holy Week services with the traditional ones?

The constitution of the Church is such that it must be the pastors who lead. At times certainly the laity are a great and necessary aid when this is simply lacking, and they must make their needs known. In the short-term the debate has been about defining what constitutes a stable group and how to make one’s request for a regular Mass offered in this form. Such matters have, since the promulgation of *Summorum Pontificum*, to a degree, been settled by questions posed to and answered by the *Ecclesia Dei* Commission. The long-term and more profound goal, however, is for priests to appreciate what this liturgy offers to their priestly life. When they do, they will want to offer it, and as pastors they will explain to the flock entrusted to them what its riches are.

It is this fact which has really impacted our mission. We have spent much more time than used to be possible

teaching and encouraging other priests to offer the old Mass. We have also been able to work in cooperation with bishops to find the best solution for their dioceses. In some cases this is an invitation to the Fraternity to open an apostolate, in others it has been to provide training for a priest or priests of the diocese.

**TLM:** *Are there areas in the Church, here in the United States or abroad, where you are encountering actual resistance to Summorum on the part of the episcopacy?*

**Father Berg:** There is undoubtedly some resistance, but this is mainly in places where the works of the Fraternity – or simply the effects of the presence of the *usus antiquior* in a diocese – are unknown. We are now present in enough dioceses for other bishops in those same countries to recognize the good work which is done and that it contributes greatly to the life of the diocese. It will always be more difficult in countries where we are just starting and are unknown.

**TLM:** *Where has FSSP encountered the most generous implementation of Summorum by local ordinaries, and where has it been the least generous?*

**Father Berg:** The most generous response has actually been here in North America. Here we have been able to establish the largest number of apostolates which are either parishes

or have the equivalent of a full parochial life. Bishops have been able to see from numerous other examples that this is the best thing they can do for their faithful. Remember, Pope Benedict has said that he wants the traditional Mass available to all Catholics – even those who have not specifically requested it. Now that is something worth pondering! When we first arrived some twenty-five years ago I think there was worry about what “Latin Mass apostolates” would turn into. Today this worry is gone. Bishops see that by offering everything to the faithful, the faithful will in turn embrace being a part of the diocese. A parish is a particular unity in a whole. It has its own life, its own character, its own pastor, but through these particular elements it fully participates in the life of the whole diocese under its bishop. Where the local ordinary believes in the good of parishes and parochial life, he sees the same good offered by a non-territorial parish for those who wish to worship and receive all the sacraments according to the traditional liturgical books. The implementation has been less generous in countries where they

---

*The long-term and more profound goal, however, is for priests to appreciate what this liturgy offers to their priestly life. When they do, they will want to offer it, and as pastors they will explain to the flock entrusted to them what its riches are.*

---



think that *Summorum Pontificum* is primarily addressed, or limited, to countries in Europe and North America who experienced the full severity of liturgical abuses, while they did not. Oftentimes in these countries the demand is seen as coming from a fringe element or one which is tied to politics. This is unfortunate, and there is still much work to be done.

### The Prospect of a General Latin Mass Revival

**TLM:** *Is there a significant and growing interest in the traditional Latin Mass among regular diocesan clergy and seminarians, and can you give some examples of this?*

**Father Berg:** The growth in interest is clear and one of the most encouraging signs for the Church. We have seen this in the hundreds of priests who have come to our seminaries to learn not only how to offer the *usus antiquior* but also to explore the reason behind the ceremonies, prayers and gestures. We have heard back from a number of them as they have implemented it in their parish, and we have heard how it has been a great contribution to their spiritual lives as priests. For the interest shown by seminarians, one example stands out for me. We made a DVD to teach priests how to say the Mass that was very well done. We offered it for free to all the candidates at a large, important diocesan seminary. I believe that over 95% of the men, including the priests on the faculty, requested a copy. I would never have imagined such a reaction ten years ago. So I would say it is not so much something that Pope Benedict forced, as that he opened the door and we are seeing how the Holy Ghost is moving souls.

**TLM:** *In how many dioceses worldwide does the Fraternity now offer a regular Sunday Mass? How many of these are in the United States?*

**Father Berg:** I believe that we are present in about 170 dioceses throughout the world and about one-third of these are in North America.

**TLM:** *Is it realistic to speak of a revival of the traditional Latin liturgy, or are we still in the phase of a Latin liturgical “quarantine” despite Summorum?*

**Father Berg:** For the reasons I have given one can certainly speak of a revival. It is small and it will take time, but I believe there are signs of a revival.

To destroy takes relatively little time. But to build up again is a much longer and more difficult process. And there is always the reality of mistrust – on both sides! – which complicates the work. But the work goes on and increases. Religious communities gathered around the traditional Mass continue to steadily grow in numbers. This is a grass-roots effort, from the ground up. If you stop to watch the grass grow it will look as though nothing is happening. But come back after a while and you will have a rich and luxuriant lawn. The FSSP is in this work for “the long haul.” We may not all live to see that richness and luxuriance fully established again in the Church, but each of us has his contribution to make toward that ultimate goal.

**TLM:** *Does FSSP have any plans for additional seminaries?*

**Father Berg:** As of now the Fraternity does not have any plans to open up an additional seminary. In the future there may be a need for a seminary in Latin America, but this will be a matter for another Superior General to decide!

### The Question of the Society of Saint Pius X

**TLM:** *What is your view of the state of affairs between the Vatican and the Society of Saint Pius X?*

**Father Berg:** The Fraternity of Saint Peter has intentionally refrained from any comment regarding the affairs between the Holy See and the Society of Saint Pius X. Our concern has been that virtually every outside commentary on this subject is more likely to hurt rather than help matters. The talks will bear the most fruit when they remain strictly between the two parties. We obviously have been actively praying for a reconciliation and will continue to do so. This is the best contribution we can make. If each of us is faithful to the work that God has entrusted to him, God will bring about the desired results. The FSSP is not in charge of the Church but at her service; we pray with confidence that through our fidelity we will have had a small part in bringing about good results throughout the Mystical Body of Christ.

**TLM:** *Are you hopeful or pessimistic regarding an eventual canonical regularization of SSPX, or do you fear there will be another excommunication?*

**Father Berg:** It is impossible to determine right now what will be the next step on the part of the Holy See

---

*The FSSP is not in charge of the Church but at her service; we pray with confidence that through our fidelity we will have had a small part in bringing about good results throughout the Mystical Body of Christ.*

---

as this will be a matter to be decided by the next Holy Father. The focus and attention dedicated to this matter by Benedict XVI however show how important it is for souls and for the Church. For this reason one must remain hopeful. Concretely, there are also many positive signs. The nomination of Archbishop Di Noia as Vice-President of the Commission *Ecclesia Dei* is a major one. He is a true Thomist and understands the theological arguments that underlie the situation. His letter addressed to the priests of the Society of Saint Pius X is a good example of this. In it, I believe, he makes the distinctions necessary for moving forward towards a resolution. All too often the disagreements have been expressed in simplistic slogans: “they do not accept the New Mass” or “they are forcing us to accept Vatican II.” But this is not a political debate where the end is measured by a gain in popular support. It is a serious theological crisis which demands that proper and careful distinctions be made and maintained. I believe Archbishop Di Noia is dedicated to this, and in my mind such a course is the only hope for a practical resolution.

**TLM:** *Do you have any ongoing relations with SSPX at any level?*

**Father Berg:** The Fraternity of Saint Peter and the Society of Saint Pius X do not have any ongoing formal relations. I believe there is a lot of contact between individual priests, and we have always encouraged this.

**TLM:** *There are some questions about the status of the SSPX.*

**Father Berg:** The precise status of the Society of Saint Pius X is up to Rome to define; and at least in the current atmosphere of talks, they seem to consider that it is better to leave this status undefined or at least unresolved. Given this, practically speaking, each priest ought to simply direct souls in accordance with the principles of moral theology regarding their obligations for Mass. These principles are unchanging. In general I would say that there has been too much, and often careless, use of loaded terms like “excommunicated,” “schismatic,” and so forth. These are terms which have precise theological and canonical meanings and consequences; anticipating the Authority of the Church in these matters or “interpreting” the Church is often not helpful.

## On Rumors of Coming Changes in the 1962 Missal

**TLM:** *There are persistent rumors that the Vatican has prepared a “hybrid” or updated Latin Missal to replace the 1962 Missal in the near future. Do you have any knowledge of this, and if so, can you comment?*

**Father Berg:** Our General House received a number of letters from faithful who were quite panicked by such rumors of late. As far as I could gather, they came from a blog, which cited a blog, which cited an unnamed priest, who heard this in Rome. I suppose this dubious trail is a result of the ‘information age’ we live in.

The Holy See has considered inserting additional saints in the calendar of the traditional Missal, but I am not aware of any other changes planned for the Missal or text of the Mass. And I would say that the adding of saints is more an

indication that the Church accepts the traditional Missal as part of a living entity in the Church.

There have always been a few voices which have advocated a “hybrid” missal, but this is unfortunately symptomatic of the liturgical age in which we live. These voices are often found among those who have no pastoral charge and look at the liturgy mostly as an object of study. The problem is that if you ask ten of them, each will give you a different point which needs to be changed. It also at times betrays a rather condescending attitude – experts who really want to help the “poor faithful” who would live the liturgy more fully, for example, “if only the priest read the collect facing the congregation from the sedilia.” In other words, no real connection with the actual prayer life of our faithful and ultimately, I regret to say, not helpful. It is not the faithful in the pew each Sunday clamoring for such things.

We have trained hundreds of diocesan priests, pastors, to offer the Mass according the Missal of 1962 and, to the best of my knowledge, none of them have any interest in looking to change the Missal. They are just pleased to find a liturgy which is stable; where they do not have to make decisions; and choose options; and animate the congregation; and wonder how it could be improved. Receiving the liturgy from the Church as something greater than oneself, rather than looking at it creatively and critically, is a fundamental principle for a real liturgical life for the priest and the faithful. And, I would add, this is only to reflect the liturgical theology of Pope Benedict XVI, which is so insistent on the liturgy as something received and not constructed.



Father Berg offers Mass in Sarasota, Florida.

**TLM:** *To what extent is FSSP open to changes in the 1962 Missal, should they be forthcoming? Would FSSP accept something like the 1965 Missal if Rome so directed?*

**Father Berg:** It has always been the position of our Fraternity that now is not the time to make changes to the Missal, if indeed there were the need for such to be made, and that we need first to have a long period of time where the liturgy is simply lived rather than being constantly scrutinized and “tweaked.” I know no one thinks that the 1962 Missal as such is the absolute apogee of the Roman Rite. But again, whether we are inclined to go forward or backward, we first need to develop a sense that the liturgy is not “mine” or (God forbid), that it is a reflection of my particular liturgical “preferences.” We must return to fundamental principles: that the sacred liturgy is the prayer of the Church and therefore, as I said, that it is first and always to be received with humility and with reverence. Through the work of the members of our Fraternity in Rome I think we have fortunately been able to stress this important point of Pope Benedict.

### A Commonly Expressed Fear

**TLM:** *A few “hardballs,” if you don’t mind, Father. First, traditional Catholics have commonly raised this concern: If faced with the demand by a local bishop to integrate into the traditional Latin Mass current practices of the new liturgy, such as communion in the hand or lay readers, how would FSSP respond?*

**Father Berg:** The local ordinary has defined powers over the liturgy which is offered in his diocese. The responses of the Holy See and even the preface of *Summorum Pontificum* point out that the rite itself is properly the domain of the Holy See. Like any other community in the Church, the Fraternity of Saint Peter abides by this hierarchical structure and it is not for the local ordinary or the Fraternity to change the rules. Otherwise there would be chaos in the governance of the Church. And the Commission *Ecclesia Dei*, I am pleased to say, has consistently responded by confirming the praxis in line with the traditional principles which guide the *usus antiquior*, especially in regard to the specifics mentioned in your question.

**TLM:** *Respecting the previous question, if Rome upheld, for example, a bishop’s demand to permit communion in*

*the hand at FSSP Masses, would the Fraternity comply?*

**Father Berg:** We did have a situation a few years ago during the Swine Flu scare in Europe where a diocese did not want to allow Communion on the tongue because of contagion. It took time for the Holy See to respond that the faithful always had the right to receive Holy Communion on the tongue if, in the meantime, the priest and faithful were willing to have Mass where only the priest

received, and Holy Communion was not offered to the faithful who made a spiritual Communion instead. I have no doubt that this was a sacrifice richly blessed by God. I believe that such a response underlines our desire to always show respect for the proper authority while remaining faithful to the principles of our foundation.

In the end, if a bishop wants to make changes to the rites, and if he sees the reception of Holy Communion in the hand as an essential act

for his faithful, then he will not want the Fraternity in his diocese. Fortunately, there are signs that such ideological support for Communion in the hand continues to diminish. There are even some dioceses today where the local ordinary, perhaps following the practice of Pope Benedict, has eliminated Communion received standing and in the hand altogether.

### On the “Reform of the Reform”

**TLM:** *What is your view of the so-called reform of the reform pertaining to the New Mass?*

**Father Berg:** It is difficult to have an opinion of something which is so utterly undefined. It is like saying you are “for the European Union,” when no one even knows what this Union is or will evolve into. To me it is not much more than a slogan which represents discontent with what we currently have. What is the point of departure, that which is being reformed? And what structure will the reform have? I think for Benedict XVI it was clear that, prior to discussing any such reform, a liturgical sense must grow in the Church. We must first live the liturgy and have it at the center of the life of the Church again. This itself will take many decades. And the contribution, and I believe a most valuable one, of the FSSP to this process will be a simple and unified fidelity to the traditional liturgy.

**TLM:** *It seems that if one adds up all the proposals of the reform-of-the-reformers one ends up with something*



A Eucharistic procession with the Fraternity.



*very close to the traditional Latin Mass. So why not simply return to where we left off – the 1962 Missal – and leave the New Mass behind as a failed experiment?*

**Father Berg:** Ultimately it does not reside with any priest to make any sort of authoritative answer to this question. It is a prerogative of the Authority of the Church to evaluate liturgical policy. If we consider the process too slow or going in a less desirable direction, it is for us to pray that God may help us as we do our work, remaining faithful to the particulars of our founding; it is not for us to usurp the Church's Authority. Else we would not be that far from the worst proponents of liturgical experimentation. There was a time when no one would dare, on his own authority, to make prescriptive suggestions regarding the liturgy of the Church. It is that old mindset of reverence for what God has given us in the liturgical prayer of the Church that we need to recapture first of all.

### **On the Alleged Silencing of the Fraternity**

**TLM:** *A common criticism of FSSP by some traditionalists is that, in exchange for regularization and acceptance by bishops, it has agreed to remain silent about the problems with certain of the Second Vatican*

*Council's texts, the grave deficiencies of the New Mass – surveyed in Monsignor Gamber's famous study, to which Cardinal Ratzinger wrote the French-language preface – and such novelties as ecumenism, religious liberty as expounded by Dignitatis humanae, and interreligious dialogue. What do you say to that criticism? Has the Fraternity been silenced in these matters?*

**Father Berg:** The Fraternity of Saint Peter has remained faithful to the Protocol of May 5, 1988, which was proposed by Cardinal Ratzinger and originally signed by Archbishop Lefebvre and which we received without change of any kind. Here it states that “with regard to certain points taught by the Second Vatican Council which seem to us able to be reconciled with the Tradition only with difficulty, we commit ourselves to have a positive attitude of study and of communication with the Holy See, avoiding all polemics.” This is not a sort of “exchange” for legal status, but rather a question of the duty of any Institute within the Church. The history of the Church is full of those who are impatient for reform, and the right and wrong way to respond; when one tries to extend beyond

his duty and office it can have disastrous consequences for souls. It is our duty to address these difficult passages, but in the proper manner with the Holy See or individual bishop. I believe this duty is laid out very well in the letter of Archbishop Di Noia to the priests of the Society of Saint Pius X. There is a point beyond which a constant emphasis, I would say almost an obsessive one, with the documents of the last ecumenical council becomes counterproductive, almost insisting upon the teaching of the council as a sort of “super-dogma,” overriding all the rest of the Church's faith and tradition, and paradoxically here the extremes meet. This can only end in distortion. In any case, we have never, as a community or as individuals, been asked to agree to anything beyond the contents of this Protocol of 1988.

*It has always been the position of our Fraternity that now is not the time to make changes to the Missal, if indeed there were the need for such to be made, and that we need first to have a long period of time where the liturgy is simply lived rather than being constantly scrutinized and “tweaked.”*

**TLM:** *Specifically, what do you think of the New Mass? Is it joyous success, as Pope John Paul II seemed to think, or a “debacle” as Monsignor Gamber wrote, with the former Cardinal Ratzinger's approval?*

**Father Berg:** The last eight years have made a great difference in how the liturgical changes are viewed and have provided some more distance to look at them objectively. Here too, the Fraternity has always been

faithful to the Protocol of May 5, 1988, which says that any such criticisms of the liturgy will be made in the same manner. Again, it is not a matter of being silent in order to have a legal status; it is a question of when and where (and to whom) one ought to speak in order to aid souls, in order to best serve the Church. I repeat, there are souls at stake. If every bishop in the Church is not “on the same page” as us, what would it avail to shake our fists and shout “debacle” as you suggest? It may satisfy the prejudices of a few who are outraged for a time, but at the risk of endangering the liturgical practice of unnumbered souls. And for what; what change would be brought about?

### **On Ecumenism and Interreligious Dialogue**

**TLM:** *What is your take on “ecumenism” – a great success or a big mistake?*

**Father Berg:** When I was in Rome as a student I used to have lunch each day with a Dutch exegesis professor in Rome who would say: “We all know that true ecumenism is really ‘you-come-in-ism’”; it is to present the Church for the conversion of souls to the Catholic Faith. Certainly

great mistakes have been made in practice these last years which fall into the general false-euphoria which believed that holding a service together would somehow gloss over the differences and make us all one. In the last years Benedict XVI made efforts to begin a new chapter in seeing ecumenical efforts more in the domain of common public causes. Here I think the point is legitimate and important for moving forward to combat an increasingly secularized world. There are principles even of the natural law which we hold in common with others, and to manifest a strong voice in the public area working together can be effective, but it cannot sacrifice the truth regarding questions of worship or theological differences.



*“The future really belongs to God” as Pope Benedict would say. But we each have a part to play as God uses us, priests especially, as His instruments in bringing about the future through what we do each day at the altar. That is why we must remain faithful! We may incur the wrath of the powerful and the disappointment of some, but it is to God alone that we will answer in the end regarding the faithful character of our service to Him.*

**TLM:** *Respecting ecumenism, would you agree with the view that it has produced a “de-missionization” of the Church so that Churchmen no longer preach the objective necessity of membership in the Church for salvation?*

**Father Berg:** It is undeniable that the new ecumenism has led to confusion for some about the Church’s missionary role. At the same time, I believe there is already a reaction to this; certainly among the younger clergy. Here the analogy of G.K. Chesterton of two men standing on opposite sides of a ravine is so appropriate. They will actually approach one another more closely on a clear day. So too in such discussions true charity demands clarity about what is true; we must see that glossing over differences ironically leads to the opposite of unity. Saint Therese would be my candidate for patroness of ecumenical affairs because it was she who said, “I have never sought anything but the truth.”

### On the New Mass

**TLM:** *Do you agree with the former Cardinal Ratzinger’s assessment that imposition of the New Missal represented “a break in the history of the liturgy whose consequences could only be tragic”?*

**Father Berg:** As Benedict XVI, he reiterated this point

concerning liturgical rupture in very similar terms in one of his final discourses which he delivered to his own seminarians in Rome. He spoke then about a false “post-Council optimism.” There needs instead to be a healthy realism which asks if priests have a better sense of their identity now; if they understand the Mass as the Sacrifice of the Cross, the most important act which they carry out in and for the Church as priests each day. At the same time Benedict XVI speaks of a false pessimism which can exaggerate the term “tragic” in describing the situation. We must recall the example of the saintly Cardinal Kung and ask ourselves what would have been his fate had he given in to pessimism in the midst of his decades-long torture and imprisonment by the Chinese Communists. “The future really belongs to God” as Pope Benedict would say. But we each have a part to play as God uses us, priests especially, as His instruments in bringing about the future through what we do each day at the altar. That is why we must remain faithful! We may incur the wrath of the powerful and the disappointment of some, but it is to God alone that we will answer in the end regarding the faithful character of our service to Him.

**TLM:** *Do you think the New Mass should remain the “normative” rite of Mass in the Western church, or do you believe, as Monsignor Gamber advocated, that the traditional Mass should be restored as the norm and the New Mass reduced to ad experimentum status?*

**Father Berg:** As you have already pointed out, Benedict XVI held the

work of Monsignor Gamber in very high esteem. But as pope, as the one whom God selected as successor of Saint Peter to “confirm the brethren,” he chose in *Summorum Pontificum* to speak of two forms, with the New Mass as the norm. I trust his wisdom in making this decision. We are all impatient for things to improve, but such decisions cannot just be made theoretically; they have to look at the good of the whole Church and consider all of the circumstances. It is difficult to know how to best proceed from the situation we are in, and I am grateful that I do not have to make and answer for such great decisions.



## On the Future

**TLM:** *Are you optimistic or pessimistic about the future of FSSP and the Latin Mass movement in general, and what are the reasons for your assessment?*

**Father Berg:** I am optimistic for the FSSP for many of the reasons given above. In the last five years we have been able finally to do much of the work which our founders had always hoped to be able to do. The formation of the clergy is a part of our apostolate laid out from the start in our Constitutions. One of our founders has said that he never thought to live to see the day when we would have the privilege of aiding the local clergy to be able to celebrate the traditional Mass. We sometimes get so bogged down in thinking about how far we have to go that we forget to thank God for how far He has already brought us! An *a priori* distrust of the 'Latin Mass' is less and less present and is almost non-existent among the younger clergy. Their approach begins with that which is found in *Summorum Pontificum*: these rites are a significant part of the rich history of the liturgical life of the Church. That is a good place to start from! Why wouldn't they want to

be able to celebrate it? If a young priest sees that the Sacrifice of the Mass is at the center of his priesthood, he will want to offer Mass each day; even when it is his day off; even without the presence of the faithful. When this is the case, I am convinced that he will be attracted to the *usus antiquior*.

**TLM:** *Do you believe that, in time, the traditional Mass will once more become the norm of the Church or at least the predominant form of the Roman Rite?*



High Mass in Vancouver

**Father Berg:** You only need to have lived a few decades to know how silly predictions for the future can be. If we want restoration in the Church of the principles represented in and by the traditional Mass, what really matters is what we do *now*. That apart, I would say that it depends on what one intends by the term 'traditional Mass.' I think that someday there will be only one form of the Roman Rite, but I do not think it will be during my lifetime. For now we have to be content – and it is better that we be so – to just carry out our duty of state for Christ and His Church each day. "The future really belongs to God." ✠

# St. Francis Xavier Mission Trip

## Piura, Peru | Aug 2-14, 2013

Organized by the Priestly Fraternity of St. Peter  
Chaplain: Fr. Rhone Lillard, F.S.S.P.

### Support our Traditional Mission.

Your help is needed to make this life-changing experience a reality for traditional youth and to help spread the Traditional Latin Mass.

To donate, register or for more information visit:  
[SFXMission.com](http://SFXMission.com) or email [sfxmission@gmail.com](mailto:sfxmission@gmail.com)

